

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 28 2006

RemarksObjections to Claims

The Examiner has objected to claims 3-12 as dependent upon a rejected claim but including allowable subject matter. The Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the claims have overcome these objections. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections to claims 3-12.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 2 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of United States patent number 6,369,918 issued to Tom et al, hereinafter referred to as Tom. The Applicant respectfully requests careful consideration of the explanation provided below regarding the rejections of claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Rejection of Claim 1 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 1 has been amended to include limitations related to claim 3 which the Examiner has indicated recites allowable subject matter. Therefore, for at least this reason, the Applicant respectfully submits that a valid prima facie obviousness rejection with respect to the amended claim 1 in view of Tom is not present. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claims 2-4 are dependent upon the amended claim 1 and therefore incorporate all the limitations of the amended claim 1. Therefore, for at least this reason, the Applicant respectfully submits that valid prima facie obviousness rejections with respect to claims 2-4 in view of Tom are not present.

Claims 5, 7, and 10 have been amended to be independent claims and each includes limitations related to subject matter identified as allowable by the Examiner. Therefore, for at least this reason, the Applicant respectfully submits that valid prima facie obviousness rejections with respect to the amended claims

HP Docket Number 10990268-1

8

SN 09/395,262
Response C

5, 7, and 10 in view of Tom are not present. Claim 6 is dependent upon the amended claim 5 and therefore incorporates all the limitations of the amended claim 5. Therefore, for at least this reason, the Applicant respectfully submits that a valid prima facie obviousness rejection with respect to claim 6 in view of Tom is not present. Claims 8-9 are dependent upon the amended claim 7 and therefore incorporate all the limitations of the amended claim 7. Therefore, for at least this reason, the Applicant respectfully submits that valid prima facie obviousness rejections with respect to claims 8-9 in view of Tom are not present. Claims 11-12 are dependent upon the amended claim 10 and therefore incorporate all the limitations of the amended claim 10. Therefore, for at least this reason, the Applicant respectfully submits that valid prima facie obviousness rejections with respect to claims 11-12 in view of Tom are not present.

Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully submit that claims are in a condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Arlin R. Jones

By 

Gregg W. Wisdom

Reg. No. 40,231

September 28, 2006

(360) 212-8052